REMARKS

This application has been carefully considered in connection with the Examiner's Office Action dated July 3, 2007. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the following.

Summary of Rejections

Claims 1-37 were pending at the time of the Office Action.

Claims 33-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Claims 1-23 and 31-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,159,579 B2 to Sharma et al. (hereinafter "Sharma") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2005/0223392 A1 to Cox et al. (hereinafter "Cox").

Claims 24-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,159,579 B2 to Sharma et al. (hereinafter "Sharma") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2005/0223392 A1 to Cox et al. (hereinafter "Cox") as applied to claim 23 above, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2006/0036448 A1 to Haynie et al (hereinafter "Haynie").

Summary of Response

The specification has been amended.

Claims 1 and 33-37 were amended.

Claims 2-32 remain as originally submitted.

Remarks and Arguments are provided below.

Summary of Claims Pending

Claims 1-37 are currently pending following this response.

Specification

The specification has been amended. Specifically, paragraph [0033] has been amended to correct a typographical error. This amendment is respectfully submitted not to introduce new matter, and is offered for clarification purposes.

Response to Rejections under Section 112

In the Office Action dated July 3, 2007, claims 33-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Claims 33-37 have been amended to read -- the computer system -- as suggested in the Office Action.

Response to Rejections under Section 103

In the Office Action dated July 3, 2007, claims 1-23 and 31-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,159,579 B2 to Sharma et al. (hereinafter "Sharma") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2005/0223392 A1 to Cox et

al. (hereinafter "Cox"). According to MPEP § 2142, three basic criteria must be met to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness:

> First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, **the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations**. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicants' disclosure.

Similarly, the fact that the Examiner has the burden of proof with respect to the elements of the *prima facie* case of obviousness is also well defined in MPEP § 2142:

> The initial burden is on the examiner to provide some suggestion of the desirability of doing what the inventor has done. To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references.

Applicants respectfully submit that the art of record does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness as to the pending claims because the art of record fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.

Claim 1:

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the call made by the non-Java application to the client library includes input parameters and that the client library parses and converts the HTTP response into return information compatible with the non-Java application. Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments do not contain

any new matter. Support for these amendments is found throughout the original disclosure, including paragraphs 0011, 0012, and 0019.

Independent claim 1 now provides:

1. A method of accessing an Enterprise Java Bean (EJB) by a non-Java application within a computing environment, comprising:

a) **making a call, ~~calling a client library~~** by the non-Java application**, to a client library, wherein the call includes input parameters**;

e) invoking a function within the client library to construct an HTTP request corresponding to the **~~calling~~** input parameters **of the call made** from the non-Java application;

f) passing the HTTP request from the client library to an EjbServlet;

g) invoking a method on an EJB by the EjbServlent based upon the HTTP request;

e) returning information from the invoked method from the EJB to the EjbServlet;

f) decoding the returned information into an HTTP response string by the EjbServlet;

g) transmitting the HTTP response from the EjbServlet to the client library; and

h) parsing **and converting** the HTTP response by the client library into return information compatible with the non-Java application and then passing the return information from the client library to the non-Java application.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is not taught or suggested by Sharma in view of Cox because Sharma in view of Cox fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations recited Claim 1. Specifically, Sharma in view of Cox fails to disclose a non-Java application, making a call, by the non-Java application, to a client library, and parsing and converting the HTTP response by the client library into return information compatible with the non-Java application.

I. Sharma in view of Cox does not teach or suggest a non-Java application.

The Office Action relied on disclosure of a client side proxy and a dynamic proxy to read on the limitation of a non-Java application. Sharma discloses in column 7, lines 39-45 that a client side API 135 may be a programming interface that enables a client side Java API for XML based Remote Procedure Call (JAX-RPC) runtime system 134 to communicate with other processes operating in the client 130. The client side API 135 may include a javax.xml.rpc.Stub interface class. Sharma discloses in column 7, lines 48-51 that a Web Services Description Language (WSDL)-to-**Java** mapping tool creates a stub class when the client 130 imports a service described in a WSDL document of the server 110. Therefore, it is clear that the stub class or client side proxy relied on in the Office Action is a Java application.

Similarly, Sharma discloses in column 8, lines 46-53, "The creation of a dynamic proxy may be supported by the getPort method defined in the javax.xml.rpc.Service interface. A serviceEnpointInterface parameter associated with this method may specify the service endpoint interface that is supported by the created dynamic proxy. The dynamic proxy may be used by client 130 to invoke an operation on a target service endpoint defined by the server 110." Therefore it is clear that the dynamic proxy relied on in the Office Action is also a Java application.

Applicants note that Sharma does disclose in column 5, lines 17-25 that while the description of the server 110 and the client 130 are associated with a JAX-RPC environment, one skilled in the art would realize that system environment may be implemented with non-Java based computing **platforms**. For example, a Java based

service client may be capable of using an XML-based RPC service deployed on a non-Java based **platform**. However, Sharma does not disclose that a non-Java based service client may be capable of using an XML-based RPC service deployed on a non-Java based platform.

The specification discloses in paragraph 0011, "The non-Java application of the present disclosure can be any computing application implementing a business-related functionality written in a non-Java language that requires access to external functionality encapsulated in an EJB." Paragraph 0011 further provides some examples of non-Java applications as FORTRAN, Visual Basic, C, Pascal, Basic, and ClearBasic. Applicants note that claim limitations must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation **consistent** with the specification. *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000)". See MPEP 2111. Applicants respectfully submit that relying on Java applications to read on the claim limitation of a "non-Java application" is not a reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.

Applicants respectfully submit that Cox does not cure the deficiencies of Sharma. For example, the Adapter of Cox that was relied on in the Office Action is disclosed in paragraph 0234 to be implemented in Java.

II. Sharma in view of Cox does not teach or suggest making a call, by the non-Java application, to a client library.

The Office Action interpreted the claim limitation of "a client library" as reading on the client side runtime system 134 of Sharma. Also, as discussed above, the Office Action interpreted the claim limitation of "the non-Java application" as the client side proxy

or the dynamic proxy of Sharma. Applicants note that Sharma does not disclose that the client side proxy or the dynamic proxy do not make calls to the client side runtime system 134. Rather, Sharma discloses that the client 130 may use the client side proxy or the dynamic proxy to invoke a method or operation on a service endpoint defined by the server 110. While Sharma discloses in column 23, lines 16-33 and lines 52-58 that the once the client 510 has invoked a remote method, the client side runtime system 525 may process the invocation, Applicants respectfully submit that this is not disclosure of the client 510 calling the client side runtime system 525. Further, Applicants note that the client 510 is not a non-Java application.

Applicants respectfully submit that Cox does not cure the deficiencies of Sharma noted above.

III. Sharma in view of Cox does not teach or suggest parsing and converting the HTTP response by the client library into return information compatible with the non-Java application.

The Office Action states on page 4, "Sharma is silent with reference to parsing the HTTP response by the client library into return information compatible with the non-Java application and then passing the return information from the client library to the non-Java application."

The Office Action relied on the adapter disclosed in paragraphs 0234 and 0235 of Cox to read on these limitations. For ease of readability, paragraphs 0234 and 0234 of Cox are reproduced below:

> "[0234] Still another preferred aspect of the present embodiment is the use of an Adapter to access the Server and exposed functionality. An "Adapter"

> is a programming object that allows various technologies simplified access to the interfaces and data exposed in all areas of the architecture of the present embodiment. The Adapter provides programmatic code that simplifies the parsing, storing, and retrieval of elements and attributes against a tagged data format document, for example, XML-formatted document, by shielding the low-level mechanics of these actions from the user. Embodiments implement the Adapter in Java and provide access to the Adapter via various industry-accepted interfaces, including C libraries and COM.
>
> [0235] In the same way that a Listener can connect to a Server via different transport mechanisms (RMI and SOAP, among others), the Adapter can also communicate with the Server by employing similar options. The choice of Adapter transport technology is independent with respect to the choice of Listener transport technology."

While Cox does disclose that the Adapter simplifies the parsing, storing, and retrieval of elements and attributes against a tagged data format document, Applicants respectfully submit that Cox does not provide any disclosure of also converting the parsed HTTP response (or tagged data format document) into return information that is compatible with the non-Java application. Further, it appears that the results data of Sharma is already compatible with the client 130, so the response does not need to be parsed and converted as claimed.

For at least the reasons established above in sections I-III, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the limitations of independent Claim 1 are not taught or suggested by Sharma in view of Cox and respectfully requests allowance of this claim.

Dependent Claims 2-23 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claim 1 and incorporate all of the limitations thereof. Accordingly, for at least the reasons established in sections I-III above, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the limitations of

dependent Claims 2-23 are not taught or suggested by Sharma in view of Cox and respectfully request allowance of this claim.

Claim 32:

Independent Claim 32 remains as originally filed.

Independent claim 32 provides:

32. A computing system for accessing an EJB by a non-Java application comprising:

a) a non-Java application in communication with a client library;

b) a means for calling the client library from the non-Java application wherein said means for calling the client library is used to establish communication between the non-Java application and the client library;

c) an EjbServlet in communication with the client library wherein the client library comprises a function to take input parameter information from the call, embed the information into an HTTP request, and transfer the request to the EjbServlet;

d) a means for transferring information between the client library and the EjbServlet wherein said means for transferring it is used to establish communication between the EjbServlet and the client library via an HTTP protocol;

e) the EjbServlet configured to receive the HTTP request from the client library and invoke a corresponding method on an EJB; and

f) a remote method interface (RMI) for invoking methods and returning Java objects between the EjbServlet and the EJB.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 32 is not taught or suggested by Sharma in view of Cox because Sharma in view of Cox fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations recited Claim 32. Specifically, Sharma in view of Cox fails to disclose a non-Java application and a means for calling the client library from the non-Java application.

Independent Claim 32 includes limitations substantially similar to the limitations discussed in sections I and II above. For at least the reasons established above in sections I and II, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the limitations of independent

Claim 32 are not taught or suggested by Sharma in view of Cox and respectfully request allowance of this claim.

Dependent Claims 33-37 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claim 32 and incorporate all of the limitations thereof. Accordingly, for at least the reasons established in sections I and II above, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the limitations of dependent Claims 33-37 are not taught or suggested by Sharma in view of Cox and respectfully request allowance of this claim.

In the Office Action dated July 3, 2007, claims 24-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,159,579 B2 to Sharma et al. (hereinafter "Sharma") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2005/0223392 A1 to Cox et al. (hereinafter "Cox") as applied to claim 23 above, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2006/0036448 A1 to Haynie et al (hereinafter "Haynie").

Claims Depending from Claim 1:

Dependent Claims 24-30 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claim 1 and incorporate all of the limitations thereof. Accordingly, for at least the reasons established in sections I-III above, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the limitations of dependent Claims 24-30 are not taught or suggested by Sharma in view of Cox and in further view of Haynie and respectfully request allowance of this claim. Applicants respectfully submit that Haynie does not cure the deficiencies of Sharma in view of Cox discussed in sections I-III.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance for the reasons stated above. If the Examiner has any questions or comments or otherwise feels it would be helpful in expediting the application, he is encourage to telephone the undersigned at (972) 731-2288.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any further fees associated with any of the foregoing papers submitted herewith, or to credit any overpayment thereof, to Deposit Account No. 21-0765, Sprint.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9-21-07

Rodney B. Carroll
Reg. No. 39,624

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
5601 Granite Parkway, Suite 750
Plano, Texas 75024
(972) 731-2288
(972) 731-2289 (facsimile)